UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/768,007	01/24/2001	Sanjay Chadha	AP835US	9266

7590 08/03/2004

Thomas Adams
Thomas Adams & Assoc.
P.O. Box 11100, Station H
Ottawa, ON K2H 7T8
CANADA

EXAMINER
LE, NHAN T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2685	6

DATE MAILED: 08/03/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/768,007	CHADHA, SANJAY	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nhan T Le	2685	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *24 January 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-13* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-13* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 3 is an incomplete claim since it does not disclose the claim limitation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

1. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Constien (US 6,259,932).

As to claim 1, Constein teaches a base unit (see fig. 1, number 1, col. 6, lines 5-14), a dual mode input/output device (see fig. 1, numbers 1, 2, col. 6, lines 5-21), computer control input device (see fig. 2, number 14, col. 6, lines 28-35), microdisplay unit (see fig. 2, number 13, col. 6, lines 28-35), inherently a microcontroller unit for receiving signals from input device and controlling images displayed by the microdisplay unit and keypad input device (see fig. 1, number 14, col. 6, lines 28-35).

2. Claims 2, 4-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Constien (US 6,259,932) in view of Jacobsen (US 6,073,034)

As to claim 2, Constein fails to teach the integrated mobile computer according to claim 1, further comprising an elongate support pivotally attached to the base unit and pivotal between a closed position alongside the base unit and an open position extending away from the base unit and above input device, the microdisplay unit being mounted upon a distal end portion of the elongate support. Jacobsen teaches the integrated mobile computer, comprising an elongate support pivotally attached to the base unit and pivotal between a closed position alongside the base unit and an open position extending away from the base unit and above input device, the microdisplay unit being mounted upon a distal end portion of the elongate suppor (see fig. 8a, number 238, col. 12, lines 47-61). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teaching of Jacobsen into the system of Constein in order to provide a better display for the user.

As to claim 4, the combination of Constein and Jacobsen also teaches a device of claim 2, wherein the base unit houses parts of wireless access device and second display unit is provided on the base unit, the second display being viewable when the support in the closed position (see Constein fig. 1, number 4, col. 6, lines 7-21).

As to claim 5, the combination of Constein and Jacobsen teaches the base unit houses an operating system (see Constein col. 6, lines 52-65).

As to claims 6-7, the combination of Constein and Jacobsen teaches a device according to claim 4, further comprising switching means for switching the dual mode

input/output device and the microdisplay when the device is opened or closed; wherein the switch means is operable automatically in dependence upon opening and closing of the support (see Constein col. 6, lines 1-35).

As to claim 8, the combination of Constein and Jacobsen teaches a device of claim 4, wherein the support has an opening through which a second display unit is visible when the support is in the closed position (see Constein fig. 1, number 4, col. 6, lines 5-14).

As to claim 9, the combination of Constein and Jacobsen teaches the computer device according to claim 4. Jacobsen fails to teach device wherein the input device comprises of set of controls for operation of the microcomputer unit, a second set of controls for operation of mobile telephone unit being provided on a part of the support so as to be accessible along side the viewing surface of the second display when the support is in the closed position, at least some of the first set of controls being so positioned as to be obscured by the support when the support is in the closed position (see fig. 1, number 5, col. 6, lines 10-15).

3. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Constein (US 6,259,932) in view of Caci (US 6,154,658)

As to claim 10, Constein teaches the computer device according to claim 1. Constein fails to teach means for connecting the device to a docking unit in a vehicle, means for providing data related to vehicle location and supplying data to the microcomputer unit, the microcomputer unit having software for operation of the combination as a navigational system. Caci teaches means for connecting the device to

a docking unit in a vehicle, means for providing data related to vehicle location and supplying data to the microcomputer unit, the microcomputer unit having software for operation of the combination as a navigational system (see col. 8, lines 7-20). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teaching of Caci into the computer device of Constein to monitor the state of vehicle and operator and the security status of vehicle.

4. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Constien (US 6,259,932) in view of Jacobsen (US 6,073,034) and further in view of Caci (US 6,154,658) and Smith (US 5,266,922).

As to claim 11, the combination of Constein and Jacobsen fails to teach the computer device in claim 9 wherein a separate display is provided in the vehicle and connected to the microcomputer unit via the connecting means. Caci teaches the computer device wherein a separate display is provided in the vehicle and connected to the microcomputer unit via the connecting means (see col. 11, lines 31-53). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teaching of Caci into the computer device of Constein and Jacobsen to improve safety hazard. In addition, the combination of Constein, Jacobsen and Cacin fails to teach the microcomputer unit is operable to disable separate display when vehicle speed exceeds a predetermined speed. Smith teaches the microcomputer unit is operable to disable separate display when vehicle speed exceeds a predetermined speed (see col. 4, lines 52-64; col. 6, lines 29-43). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made

to provide the teaching of Smith into the computer device of Constein, Jacobsen and Caci in order to provide safety to the driver.

5. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Caci (US 6,154,658) in view of Smith (US 5,266,922).

As to claim 12, Caci teaches the combine of global positioning system receiver installed in a vehicle and connected to a computer, the receiver periodically supplying to the computer data as to the position of the vehicle (see fig. 2, 14, 12 col. 8, lines 7-20) the computer having software for computing from the data a current vehicle speed, comparing the current speed with a reference speed (see figure 2, 14, 12, col. 14,lines 31-53). Caci fails to teach disabling an in-vehicle display when the current speed exceeds reference speed. Smith teaches disabling an in-vehicle display when the current speed exceeds reference speed (see col. 4, lines 52-64; col. 6, lines 29-43). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teaching of Smith into the computer device of Caci in order to improve mobile communication.

6. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Constein (US 6,259,932) in view of Caci (US 6,154,658) and further in view of Smith (US 5,266,922).

As to claim 13, Constein fails to teach the computer device having an interface for connection to a global positioning system receiver and software for computing from data supplied by the a current vehicle speed, comparing the current speed with a reference speed, and disabling an in-vehicle dismay when the current speed exceeds

the reference speed. Caci teaches global positioning system receiver installed in a vehicle and connected to a computer, the receiver periodically supplying to the computer data as to the position of the vehicle, the computer having software for computing from the data a current vehicle speed, comparing the current speed with a reference speed (see figure 2, 14, 12, col. 14,lines 31-53). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teaching of Caci into the device of Constein in order to locate the device user. The combination of Constein and Caci fails to teach disabling an in-vehicle display when the current speed exceeds reference speed. Smith teaches disabling an in-vehicle display when the current speed exceeds reference speed (see col. 4, lines 52-64; col. 6, lines 29-43). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teaching of Smith into the computer device of Constein and Caci in order to provide safety to the driver.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-13 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Makela (US 6,047,196) teaches communication device with two modes of operation.

Chalier et al (US 6,334,063) teaches electronic device with autopositioning virtual image display and associated method.

Shin (US 6,006,109) teaches wireless data communication system using microphone/headphone jack of portable phone.

Henderson (US 6,035,214) teaches laptop computer with integrated telephone.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nhan T Le whose telephone number is 703-305-4538. The examiner can normally be reached on 08:00-05:00 (Mon-Fri).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward Urban can be reached on 703-305-4385. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Nhan Le

EDWARD F. URBAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600